



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,312	09/30/2003	Vivek Jain	JP920030093US1	9424
7590		12/10/2007		
T. Rao Coca IBM Corporation Almaden Research Center 650 Harry Road San Jose, CA 95120				
			EXAMINER	
			AHMED, AFFAF	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,312	Applicant(s) JAIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Affaf Ahmed	Art Unit 3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-33 and 35-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-33 & 35-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is in reply to Applicant's amendment filed on 09/28/2007.
2. Claims 29-33 and 35-56 have been amended.
3. Claim 34 has been canceled.
4. Claims 29-33 and 35-56 are currently pending and have been examined.
5. *To clarify the record, Examiner is correcting typographical error of claim rejections under 35USC 112 first paragraph to claim rejections 35 USC 112 second paragraph.*

Response to Applicant's Arguments

6. Applicant's amendment and arguments filed on 10/01/2007 have been fully considered and discussed in the next section. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation.
7. Applicant amends the drawings. Objection is withdrawn.
8. Applicant fails to amend claims 44 and 50 to overcome claim rejections 35 USC 112 second paragraph, therefore the claim rejections of claims 44 and 50 is maintained.
9. With respected to claims 29,43,49,55 and 56 applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground (s) of rejection.

Response Objection

10. Applicant fails to correctly summarize the amendments in response to the first office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. Claims 29-33, 35-43, 44-48, 55, 54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not

described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

- Claims 30-33, 35-42, 44-48 and 50-54 recite "*the method and/or the system as recited in claim xx all the limitations of which are incorporated herein by reference, ...*". It is unclear what Applicant is referring to by all the limitations of which are incorporated herein by reference. Dependent claims must further limit the independent claim according to the MPEP. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.
- Claims 29, 43, 44, 55 and 56 recite the limitations of "*such that said state of a customer comprises a purchase frequency and a monetary value of purchases, and such that said constraints comprises costs of marketing channels, effectiveness of said marketing channels, and customer preferences for said marketing channels wherein said determining of said optimal marketing strategy comprises identifying all possible states of customers, and wherein said identifying of said all possible states of customers comprises identifying all relevant attributes of customers, and partitioning said customers into partitions based on identified attributes using a similarity measure based on a historic policy, actual rewards and transition probabilities from one point to another, said partitions forming new states of said customers.*"

The specification discloses "Draw an arbitrary separating hyperplane on the data space S' that partition the space into $S'.sub.1$ and $S'.sub.2$. Now consider the segment, which has large variance across the data points with respect to the estimated value $V(.pi..sup.H)$, where $.pi..sup.H$ is the historic policy adopted. Based on the historic policy, the actual rewards, the transition probabilities from one data point to another, a model is constructed to compute the value at all the data points. This segment say $S'.sub.1$ is further segmented into two sub-partitions using the least square estimation." The specification does not disclose how the historic policy is calculated using π , what the actual rewards are and how they are determined, and how the transition probabilities from one point to another is determined.

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 29, 43, 50, 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- Claims 30-33, 35-42, 44-48 and 50-54 recite the limitation "*the method and /or the system as recited in claim.... all the limitations of which are incorporated herein by reference*"

It is unclear what applicant is referring to by *all the limitations of which are incorporated herein by reference*. An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed (In re Zletz, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

- Claim 44 recites the limitation of "*a first sub-unit operable for determining sequences in which selected initiatives are deployed, if more than one initiative is selected.*" It has been held that actions that may or may not be done is indefinite and does not distinguish the claim from the prior art. (In re Collier, 158 USPQ 266 (CCPA 1968)).
- Claim 50 recites the limitation of "*determining sequences in which selected initiatives are deployed, if more than one initiative is selected.*" It has been held that actions that may or may not be done is indefinite and does not distinguish the claim from the prior art. (In re Collier, 158 USPQ 266 (CCPA 1968)).
- Claims 29, 43, 49, 55 and 56 recite the limitations of "*such that said state of a customer comprises a purchase frequency and a monetary value of purchases, and such that said constraints comprises costs of marketing channels, effectiveness of said marketing channels, and customer preferences for said marketing channels wherein said determining of said optimal marketing strategy comprises identifying all possible states of customers, and wherein said identifying of said all possible states of customers comprises identifying all relevant attributes of customers, and partitioning said customers into partitions based on identified attributes using a similarity measure based on a historic policy, actual rewards and transition probabilities from one point to another, said partitions forming new states of said customers.*"

It is unclear what applicant is referring to by historic policy, actual rewards and transition probabilities from one point to another, partitions forming new states of customers. Also, it is unclear how pi is applied to determine the historic policy. Furthermore, it is unclear how customer preferences for marketing channels will be determined. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required. For the purpose of this examination, Examiner

interprets the above limitation as using clustering algorithm based on shoppers' history and rewards offers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 29, 30, 37, 38, 40, 43-45, 47-49, 50-51, and 54-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Honarvar et al., US 6,321,206 B2 in view of Herz et al, US Pub No: 2001/0014868 A1 and further in view of Boyd et al US Pat No: 7072848 B2.

Examiner's Note: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Claims 29,43 and 49:

Honarvar discloses:

- *Generating a plurality of marketing strategies;*
- *Deploying the determined optimal marketing strategy;*
- *Recording customer response to the deployed optimal marketing strategy;*
- *Updating information corresponding to the state of a customer based on the recorded customer response;*
- *Repeating steps b to e for the specified time period.*

See at least column 6, lines 34-62, column 2, lines 63-67 and column 11, lines 49-54.

Honarvar does not disclose, but Herz, however, does disclose:

- *Determining an optimal marketing strategy based on a state of a customer and constraints corresponding to marketing channel (see at least paragraphs 2 and 3) such that said state of a customer comprises a purchase frequency and a monetary value of purchases (see at least paragraph 5) wherein said determining of said optimal marketing strategy comprises identifying all possible states of customers, and wherein said identifying of said all possible states of customers comprises identifying all relevant attributes of customers and partitioning said customers into partitions based on identified attributes using a similarity measure based on a historic policy, actual rewards (see at least paragraph 19), and transition probabilities from one point to another, said partitions forming new states of said customer (see at least paragraph 158-161);*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Honarvar's method of creating strategies to control movement of clients across categories with Herz's technique for automatic determination of customized prices and promotions with the motivation of maximizing vendor's profits by motivating clients to move from one consumption category to another based on customized prices and promotions offered as incentives.

The combination of Honarvar /Herz does not disclose, but Boyd however does disclose:

- *such that said constraints comprises costs of marketing channels, effectiveness of said marketing channels, and customer preferences for said marketing channels (column 4, lines 26-33).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Honarvar's/ Herz's method of creating strategies to control movement of clients across categories and customized prices and promotions with Boyd's advertisements channel specific modeling technique to

optimize an organization's marketing strategy to maximize vendors' profits using efficiency sources to reach consumers

Claims 30, 44 and 50:

Honarvar / Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Selecting at least one initiative that enables an addressing of the specified objective.*
- *Determining sequences in which selected initiatives are deployed, if more than one initiative is selected.*
- *Combining the selected initiatives in the determined sequences to obtain the plurality of marketing strategies.*

See at least column 3, lines 11-31 and column 5, lines 14 – 25 and figure 7.

Claims 31 and 32:

Honarvar /Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Varying parameters of initiatives to generate new initiatives (see at least column 3, lines 20-32 and column 10, lines 13-20);*
- *Varying deployment time of initiatives (see at least column 3, lines 11-20 and fig 11).*

Claims 33, 38, 45, 51 and 56:

Honarvar / Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Determining an optimal policy for each state based on past data (see at least column 3, lines 25-28);*

- *Identifying the state of a customer, the customer visiting a merchant or the customer being selected from a database of customer (see at least column 3, lines 32-34);*
- *Identifying the optimal policy for an identified customer state (see at least column 3, lines 39-43);*
- *Modeling customer's preferences for marketing channels, cost and effectiveness of different marketing channels, and the specified budget as effective constraints (see at least fig 7 with the associated text and column 3, lines 4-6);*
- *Determining an optimal feasible policy based on effective constraints corresponding to marketing channels; and determining the optimal marketing strategy from the optimal feasible policy (see at least fig 7 with associated text).*

Claim 37, 47 and 53:

Honarvar / Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Selecting the marketing strategy, which maximizes a value for the state over all marketing strategies for a given state; and repeating said step of selecting for each state (see at least column 9, lines 9-40 and fig 7, and fig 11 with associated text).*

Claims 40, 48 and 54:

Honarvar/ Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Identifying a resulting state of the customer (see at least column 13, lines 52-55);*
- *Updating values of the state of the customer (see at least column 13, lines 61-64);*
- *Updating an optimal policy (see at least column 14, lines 54-67).*

Claim 55:

Honarvar/Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *A database storing information regarding initiatives that are offered to customer (see at least column 15, lines 47-49);*
- *Marketing channels available for executing the initiatives, cost and effectiveness of the marketing channels (see at least fig 7 and associated text), and states of customers (see at least column 9, lines 34-42);*
- *Enabling a merchant to specify at least one objective for a specified time period (see at least column 12, lines 51-56);*
- *Generating a plurality of marketing strategies based on the objective specified by the merchant, the marketing strategies being a combination of initiatives; and a component operable for determining the optimal marketing strategy and at least one marketing channel based on a state of a customer and cost and effectiveness of marketing channels (see at least the abstract and fig 7 with associated text);*

Honarvar does not disclose, but Herz, however, does disclose:

- *such that said state of a customer comprises a purchase frequency and a monetary value of purchases (see at least paragraph 5) wherein said determining of said optimal marketing strategy comprises identifying all possible states of customers, and wherein said identifying of said all possible states of customers comprises identifying all relevant attributes of customers and partitioning said customers into partitions based on identified attributes using a similarity measure based on a historic policy, actual rewards (see at least paragraph 19), and transition probabilities from one point to another, said partitions forming new states of said customer (see at least paragraph 158-161).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Honarvar's method of creating strategies to control movement of clients across categories with Herz's technique for automatic determination of customized prices and promotions with the motivation of

maximizing vendor's profits by motivating clients to move from one consumption category to another based on customized prices and promotions offered as incentives.

Claim 56:

Honarvar / Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Generating a plurality of marketing strategies (see at least column 6, lines 36-37);*
- *Determining all possible states of customers (see at least column 3, lines 21-24);*
- *Determining an optimal policy for each state based on past data (see at least column 3, lines 25-28);*
- *Identifying the state of a customer, the customer visiting a merchant or the customer being selected from a database of customers (see at least column 3, lines 32-34);*
- *Identifying the optimal policy for an identified customer state (see at least column 3, lines 39-43);*
- *Modeling customer's preferences for marketing channels, cost and effectiveness of different marketing channels, and the specified budget as effective constraints (see at least fig 7 with associated text and column 3, lines 4-6). Honarvar does not specifically specify budget as effective constraint, however the above limitation is inherently implemented in decision management system where marketing strategy and advertising mechanisms are implemented;*
- *Determining an optimal feasible policy based on the identified optimal policy and effective constraints corresponding to marketing channels;*
- *Determining an optimal marketing strategy from the optimal feasible policy (see at least fig 7 with the associated text);*
- *Deploying the determined optimal marketing strategy;*
- *Recording customer response to the deployed marketing strategy;*
- *Identifying a resulting state of the customer;*
- *Updating values of the state of the customer;*

- *Updating the optimal policy;*
- *Repeating steps c to m for the specified time period;*

See at least column 6, lines 34-62, column 2, lines 63-67 and column 11, lines 49-54;

Honarvar does not disclose, but Herz, however, does disclose:

- such that said states of customers comprise a purchase frequency and a monetary value of purchases (see at least paragraph 5);
- *wherein said determining of said optimal marketing strategy comprises identifying all possible states of customers, and wherein said identifying of said all possible states of customers comprises identifying all relevant attributes of customers and partitioning said customers into partitions based on identified attributes using a similarity measure based on a historic policy, actual rewards (see at least paragraph 19), and transition probabilities from one point to another, said partitions forming new states of said customer (see at least paragraph 158-161).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Honarvar's method of creating strategies to control movement of clients across categories with Herz's technique for automatic determination of customized prices and promotions with the motivation of maximizing vendor's profits by motivating clients to move from one consumption category to another based on customized prices and promotions offered as incentives.

16. Claims 35, 36, 39, 40-42, 46 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honarvar et al, US Pat. No. 6,321,206 B1 in view of Herz et al, US Pub No: 2001/0014868 A1 in view of Boyd et al US Pat No: 7072848 B2 and further in view of Ulwick et al, US. Pat. No. 6,115,691.

Claim 36, 40 and 41:

Honarvar / Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Computing transition probabilities from a given state to another state for the policy (see at least column 6, lines 52-67 and column 9, lines 1-4);*

The combination of Hanvar/ Herz/Boyd does not disclose, however Ulwick does disclose:

- *Computing value of expected immediate reward for the policy in the state;*
- *Computing discounted expected value of a resulting state for the policy;*
- *Computing a sum of expected immediate reward and the discounted expected value;*
- *Computing a sum of a new immediate reward;*
- *A discounted value corresponding to the resulting stat;*
- *Reduced by a value corresponding to an initial state of the customer;*
- *Updating the values corresponding to the initial state of the customer by adding a fraction of the computed sum to a value of a previous state of the customer; and*

See at least column 9, lines 2-4 and column 7, lines 46-50.

- *Propagating a change in the value of the state to all other states (see at least column 6, lines 53-67 and column 9, lines 5- 17).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to compute discount and sum of rewards to maintain consumers loyalty and to obtain an optimum solution over time.

Claims 35,46 and 52:

Honarvar / Herz / Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

The combination of Honarvar/Herz/Boyd does not disclose, however Ulwick does disclose:

- *Identifying a deterministic policy (see at least column 6, lines 6-13); It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to obtain and implement the best strategy to maintain consumers loyalty.*
- *Initializing a value of all possible states for the policy (see at least column 6, lines 17-21); It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify*

Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization so no corrupted data is produced.

- *Computing the value of a state for the policy* (see at least column 6, lines 53- 67 and fig 15 with associated texts). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to obtain the most effective and efficient result of the strategy.
- *Repeating said step of computing for all possible states* (see at least column 16, lines 17-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to insure validity of the outcome results.
- *constructing a new improved policy* (see at least column 6, lines 23-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to obtain the most effective result of the strategy.
- *Iteratively performing steps of computing, repeating, and constructing until the new improved policy remains unchanged for two subsequent iterations* (see at least column 21, lines 48-56 and column 16, lines 41-46). It would have been obvious to insure the suitability and the technique that implement is beneficial and will produce an efficient outcome results.
- *Selecting the policy with maximum value for the state as the optimal policy for the given state* (see at least column 16, lines 40-53, and fig 19(a) with the associated texts). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to obtain the most desired solution of the outcome.

Claim 39:

Honarvar /Herz/Boyd discloses the limitations as shown above.

Honarvar further discloses:

- *Determining an optimal feasible policy based on effective constraints corresponding to marketing channels comprises (see at least fig 7 and associated text);*

The combination of Honarvar / Herz /Boyd does not disclose, however Ulwick does disclose:

- *Mapping the optimal policy uniquely to a closest feasible optimal policy based on the effective constraints, if the effective constraints are not satisfied by the optimal policy (see at least fig18(c) and associated text).*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Honarvar's creating strategies techniques with Ulwick's strategies evaluation and optimization to create the optimal solution that will deliver the most value given effort, risk and cost that consumer is willing to expend.

Conclusion

17. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

18. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Cunningham et al, US Pat No: 6,029,139, teaches method and apparatus for optimizing promotional sale of product based upon historical data.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Affaf Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-270-1835. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 am-6:00 pm est, alt Fridays off.

Application/Control Number:
10/674,312
Art Unit: 3622

Page 15

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached at 571-272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AA


RETTA YEHDEGA
PRIMARY EXAMINER